

64



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/613,028	07/10/2000	Eric Michael Lunsford	PALM-3184.US.P	9582

7590 01/10/2005

Wagner Murabito & Hao LLP
 Two North Market Street Third Floor
 San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

MENGISTU, AMARE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2673

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/613,028

Applicant(s)

LUNSFORD ET AL.

Examiner

Amare Mengistu

Art Unit

2673

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification as originally filed does not disclose the new claim limitations of claims 1, 11, 23 and 36 “wherein said data input ... **and is in an unabuttet location relative to a perimeter of a display device**”. The input surface is **unabuttet location relative to a perimeter of a display device** was not described in the specification at the time of the application was filed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, 11-15, 23-27, 36-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Deeran et al (5,594,471)** in view of **Liao et al (6,507,338)**.

5. As to claims 1-5,11-15,23-27, **Deeran et al** (hereinafter **Deeran**) discloses a data input surface for detecting a gesture performed thereon by a user (fig.1 (12,14,15,17, 18)) for facilitating recognition of said gesture as corresponding to a particular data input, wherein said data input surface is responsive to a touch thereon (fig.7), a user removable template having one of a plurality of marking configurations ((fig.1 (15,17), col.2, lines 53-63), wherein each marking configurations facilitates operating said data input in one of a plurality of functional configurations (col.3, lines 36-39, col.4, lines 31-35), wherein said user removable template is positioned over said data input surface for dividing said data input surface into a first data input area (fig.12,15) and a second data input area (fig.1 (17)), wherein said first data input area is configured to facilitate recognition of one or more first gestures (fig.1 (12,15) "special 1....special 4", "F1... F10"), and wherein a said second data input area is configured to facilitate recognition of one or more second gestures associated with one of said function (fig.1 (17) "Ent, Alt, Ctrl, PgUp, pgDn"). **Deeran** did not expressly detailed that the data input is in an unabutted location relative to a perimeter of a display device. However, the patent of **Liao et al** clearly teaches that it is well known for a touch pad to unabuttedly located the data input relative to the perimeter of the display (see, fig.2 (42), (40)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have been motivated to incorporated unabuttedly locate the data input at the perimeter of the display as taught by **Liao et al** into the display system of **Deeran** since this is an alternative method of allocating the input data since this will allow the user to view the display in comfortable position.

As to claims 23 and 36, also **Deeran et al** discloses an electronic system comprising: an electronic display device (fig.2 (26)) coupled to a bus (fig.2 (24)); a memory device (fig.2 (27)) coupled to said bus (fig.2 (24)); a data input device (fig.2 (10)) coupled to said bus (fig.2 (24)); a data input surface (fig.1 (14,16)); a user removable template (fig 1(15,17), col.2, lines 53-63), a first data input area (fig.1 (17); fig.4 (Zone 2), also see, col.3, lines 36-45, col.4, lines 61- col.5, lines 5); a second data input area (fig.1(15); fig.4 (Zone 1,3) note: col.3, lines 36-45, col.5, lines 6-13). It is inherent for **Deeran et al** device to have a processor and the processor to be coupled to a bus.

As to claims 24-27,37-40, **Deeran et al** discloses said one or more first gesture correspond to a plurality of handwriting strokes (col.4, lines 61-col.5, lines 5); a second data input area is a keyboard template (col.4, lines 31-34); a second data input area is an application shortcut (col.5, lines 6-13); wherein said plurality of application correspond to a predetermined number of previously invoked applications (col.4, lines 61- col.5, lines 5)

6. Claims 22,35,48 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Deeran et al (5,594,471)** in view of **Liao et al** and **Matsui et al (5,493,365)**.

As to claims 22 and 48, **Deeran et al** discloses removable templates, but has failed to teach configuring the removable of the data input. However, Matsui et al clearly teaches that it is well known for the user removable data input device includes a mechanism for automatically configuring to recognize said user removable data input device (col.4, lines 23-35).

In regard to claims 35 and 49, **Matsui** also discloses an electronic system having one or more communication ports (see, fig.1 (16); fig.2 (36-38,43); fig.3, the key unit communicating with CPU; fig.7 (75)).

7. Claims 6,16,28,41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Deeran et al (5,594,471)** in view of **Liao et al** further in view of **Ganthier et al (5,865,546)** and **Sylvan et al (5,572,573)**.

8. As to claims 6,16,28,41 **Deeran et al** discloses a removable input device but did not explicitly disclose discloses the input device including a game control keys. However; **Ganthier et al** discloses a keyboard module and suggest that a user can replace each input device module with a different input device (see, abstract; col.2, lines 56-64).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have been motivated to replace one of the input device with a game control device as taught by **Ganthier** into the device of **Deeran et al** because this will allow the user with more flexibility to control and minimizing the amount of input device on the keyboard.

9. Claims 21,34 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Deeran et al (5,594,471)** in view of **Liao et al** and **Sylvan et al (5,572,573)**.

10. As to claims 21,34 and 47 **Deeran et al** discloses a computer touch screen input device, but **Deeran et al** has failed to disclose that the computer system is a PDA. The patent of **Sylvan et al** is cited to teach that it is well known for **PDA** to have both touch pad or a keyboard (see, figs.1, 2, 8 and 9).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have been motivated to use a PDA with a keyboard or touch screen as taught by **Sylvan et al** into the device of **Deeran et al**, since this will provide user with more compact and efficient electronic input system.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6,11-16,21-28,33-42,47-49 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2673

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amare Mengistu whose telephone number is (703) 305-4880. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, T-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (703) 305-4938. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.


Amare Mengistu
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2673

A.M
January 6, 2005